

Zoophilia and its Societal Perception

Zoophilia, and by extension, bestiality, are topics that suffer from an unnecessary level of taboo for a multitude of reasons. This is the topic of human sexual and romantic relations to animals, and is the center of much controversy. A primary reason for the taboo reaching its present levels is the misunderstanding and grouping of the distinct terms of bestiality and zoophilia together. Another reason for the application of many negative associations is the preconceived idea that human intercourse with an animal is only ever acted out of sadistic lust and will always end in the animal's harm, which simply isn't true. Assertions that the animal is always forced into the sex, without any agency of its own, is yet another reason for taboo. The many misconstrued correlations and hypocritical moral prejudice against zoophiles turns what may be a field for open discussion and help into a place where certain emotions must be hidden as pure abominations.

It is arguable that the terms of “zoophilia” and “bestiality” are different in nature. Those who classify under zoophilia are generally those who have, “...forbidden desires towards animals” (Thomas Francis), that are often romantic in nature, though not always sexual. Zoophiles will argue that zoophilia is simply, “...an orientation” (Thomas Francis), like the other sexual orientations humans are born with and that they treat the animals they are attracted to as they would, “...spouses” (Thomas Francis), of theirs. Bestiality is best described as the simple lust for sexual acts with animals, though it may include, “instances...that [injure] the animal...” (Thomas Francis), involved. This is a stark contrast from the more romantically-treated zoophilia, and thus such acts should not be grouped directly in with zoophilia as doing so causes false accusations to fly as stereotypes of both being the same begin to form.

Animals do not always need to be harmed during intercourse with a human being, nor must their handlers have sadistic tendencies with them otherwise. An infamous case of a man having intercourse with a horse serves as testament to this. When the man died due to complications that arose from the sex, police investigated and confiscated many sex tapes of animals and men, including the

aforementioned case, and, “...found no evidence of abused animals...” (Charles Mudede) on any of them. Zoophiles also tend to understand when an animal's physical factor can make it dangerous to have intercourse with, expressing, “...revulsion for sex with animals that [have] not fully matured” (Thomas Francis), preventing them further from harming the animals. The fact that zoophiles often have deep, “...emotional relationships” (Thomas Francis), with their animals deters them more from sadism, as they'd be harming something they care about. Sex is a natural act and the mere fact of an animal performing the act in a place other than intended does not mean harm is being inflicted.

The fact of an animal's ability to give consent is likely the largest center of controversy. Animals are very receptive to certain scents and smells, and stallions, for example, will willingly become stimulated and may begin intercourse if they smell a, “...mare in heat” (Zoophile Web). Smelling like such (possibly through contact with animals like the mare) is one way zoophiles get animals to choose to have sex with them. Responses that this is similar to drugging the creature are dumbfounded as it would still have full cognitive ability. When one is by an animal like a mare and has the animal respond well to sexual advances, “...by raising [its] tail and squatting” (Zoophile Web), instead of running away, it may be seen as the creature giving consent as it's giving itself. The, “...nonverbal cues for sex...” (Thomas Francis), animals give can be determined through basic nature, as the animal would not just leave itself exposed if it felt threatened. Consent goes far beyond what a creature can linguistically communicate.

Arguments against zoophilia include the aforementioned topics of how it affects the animal and the consent it can give, in addition to it simply being seen as morally wrong. Opposers will see bestiality as immediately, “...equal[ing] animal cruelty...” (Thomas Francis). This stems from the belief that animals can't give any consent due to having “...less developed brain[s]” (Thomas Francis), that can't understand human coercion. People will also believe that, “...hav[ing] sex with animals” (Thomas Francis) simply isn't okay due to social taboo that may have developed from the years of repression of the act. The original point was addressed in the third paragraph, and the second point may be addressed

through acknowledging that sex is a natural instinct of all animals and so it is silly to claim that another creature with the instinct would not be able to understand it. The last point presents a hypocrisy in the fact that many taboos on sexuality have been lifting in recent time (e.g. homosexuality) and yet zoophiles are not being given the same platform to speak as the other sexuality groups due to preconceived connotations. Zoophilia is a topic that must be discussed and not hidden due to emotion.

Zoophilia and bestiality are often given false associations that wrongly group people and cause untrue accusations. As long as care is shown, a zoophile shouldn't be able to harm an animal they have as a partner. Unspoken cues and body language and also go leagues in communicating how an animal is feeling about any act, and as long as these cues are heeded the animal should be fine. Taboos may present detrimental results when limiting proper discussion, so hope to get over previously held connotations to allow communication would be prudent.

Bibliography

“Those Who Practice Bestiality Say They're Part of the Next Sexual Rights Movement”

Thomas Francis

<http://www.browardpalmbeach.com/news/those-who-practice-bestiality-say-theyre-part-of-the-next-sexual-rights-movement-6334747>

“The Animal in You”

Charles Mudede

<http://www.thestranger.com/seattle/Content?oid=30811>

Zoophile: How To: Equines (Zoophile Web)

Anonymous

<http://zoo6cxl4rtac3jxw.onion/equines.html>

(Page only accessible through the Deep Net, so pictures of citations are below)

2) The Approach: Quietly walk up to about 10' from him and stop. Let him come to you to investigate. Move very slowly, so as not to startle him, and let him sniff you over...gently pet his neck and withers and murmur encouraging words -win his trust-. At this point it is helpful to smell like a mare in heat...it does wonders for their libido.

3) Smell like an estrus mare: Find a mare in heat, usually 5-6 days out of every 21 (I know it ain't that easy). Approach as in 2) above...pet her flanks and work your way slowly back to rub her tush, and base of her tail. Watch her ears...if she resents this contact she will flatten them back, and swish her tail...further pursuit could lead to being kicked. If the mare does not seem to object, GENTLY dip a finger into her vulva, getting her natural aroma on your hands...some mares will not cooperate and move away from the contact... remember, that is their choice. If the mare tolerates your advances, continue to massage her privates...if she really responds well (by raising her tail and squatting), you can try...oh, yeah...that's for my follow-up article soon to come "How to have more fun with your mare"

5) The Rub: Let the stallion smell the nice, fresh mare odor on your hands- he should respond with snorts, whinnies and (hopefully) an erection. Starting with his neck, pet him gently, massaging his withers and slowly working your way back to his belly and privates. Some studs will get kinda twitchy at this point, swish their tails and kick- stay close to his body, and away from his rear to be safe...avoid being mashed into the stall walls by his body. If he starts to act up quit immediately, calm him down, and start again from the beginning of this step.